

N.Y.S.D. Case #  
09-cv-0118(VM)

13-1581

Lomeli v. Fairfield Greenwich

**MANDATE**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

**SUMMARY ORDER**

RULINGS BY SUMMARY ORDER DO NOT HAVE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT. CITATION TO A SUMMARY ORDER FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2007, IS PERMITTED AND IS GOVERNED BY FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 32.1 AND THIS COURT'S LOCAL RULE 32.1.1. WHEN CITING A SUMMARY ORDER IN A DOCUMENT FILED WITH THIS COURT, A PARTY MUST CITE EITHER THE FEDERAL APPENDIX OR AN ELECTRONIC DATABASE (WITH THE NOTATION "SUMMARY ORDER"). A PARTY CITING A SUMMARY ORDER MUST SERVE A COPY OF IT ON ANY PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of November, two thousand thirteen.

PRESENT: DENNIS JACOBS,  
BARRINGTON D. PARKER,  
DENNY CHIN,  
Circuit Judges.

- - - - -X  
MIGUEL LOMELI, MORNING MIST HOLDINGS  
LIMITED,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

AXA PRIVATE MANAGEMENT,  
Lead Plaintiff,

PASHA S. ANWAR, ON BEHALF OF  
THEMSELVES AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY  
SITUATED INVESTORS IN THE GREENWICH  
SENTRY, L.P. PRIVATE INVESTMENT  
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, JULIA ANWAR, ON  
BEHALF OF THEMSELVES AND ALL OTHERS  
SIMILARLY SITUATED INVESTORS IN THE  
GREENWICH SENTRY, L.P. PRIVATE  
INVESTMENT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET  
AL.,

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #:  
DATE FILED: December 20, 2013

**MANDATE ISSUED ON 12/20/2013**

Plaintiffs,

SHIMON LAOR, ET AL.,  
Consolidated Plaintiffs,

ARJAN MOHANDAS BHATIA, ET AL.,  
All Plaintiffs,

-v.-

13-1581

SECURITIES & INVESTMENT COMPANY  
BAHRAIN, ET AL.,  
Plaintiff-Appellees,

-v.-

FAIRFIELD GREENWICH LIMITED, A CAYMAN  
ISLAND COMPANY, ET AL.,  
Defendants-Appellees,

FAIRFIELD GREENWICH ADVISORS L.L.C.,  
AMIT VIGAYVERGIA, CITCO FUND SERVICES  
(EUROPE) B.V.,

Defendants - Consolidated  
Defendants - Appellees,

YANKO DELLAW SCHIAVA, ET AL.,  
Consolidated Defendants -  
Appellees,

FAIRFIELD GREENWICH CORP.,  
Consolidated Counter  
Defendant - Appellee,

1-20 JOHN DOES,  
Defendants,

- - - - -X

**FOR APPELLANT:**

ROBERT A. WALLNER, Milberg LLP,  
New York, New York (Jennifer L.  
Young, Kristi Stahnke McGregor,  
Milberg LLP, Stephen Weiss,  
Parvin Aminolroaya, Seeger Weiss  
LLP, on the brief), for  
Plaintiffs-Appellants Miguel  
Lomeli and Morning Mist Holdings  
Limited.

**FOR APPELLEES:**

DAVID A. BARRETT, Boies, Schiller  
& Flexner LLP, New York, New  
York (Howard L. Vickery, II,  
Stuart H. Singer, Boies,  
Schiller & Flexner LLP, Robert  
C. Finkel, James A. Harrod,  
Natalie M. Mackiel, Wolf Popper  
LLP, Christopher Lovell, Victor  
E. Stewart, Lovell Stewart  
Halebian Jacobson LLP, on the  
brief), for Plaintiffs-  
Appellees.

MARK G. CUNHA, Simpson Thacher &  
Bartlett LLP, New York, New York  
(Peter E. Kazanoff, Jeffrey L.  
Roether, Jeffrey E. Baldwin, and  
Nicholas S. Davis, on the  
brief), for Fairfield Greenwich  
Limited, Fairfield Greenwich  
(Bermuda) Limited, Fairfield  
Heathcliff Capital LLC,  
Fairfield Risk Services Limited,  
Lourdes Barreneche, Vianney  
d'Hendecourt, Yanko Della  
Schiava, Harold Greisman,  
Jacqueline Harary, Richard  
Landsberger, Daniel E. Lipton,  
Julia Luongo, Mark McKeefry,  
Charles Murphy, Corina Noel  
Piedrahita, Maria Teresa Pulido  
Mendoza, Santiago Reyes, Andrew  
Smith, Philip Toub, and Amit  
Vijayvergiya.

1 MARC E. KASOWITZ, Kasowitz Benson  
2 Torres & Friedman LLP, New York,  
3 New York (Daniel J. Fetterman,  
4 on the brief), for Jeffrey H.  
5 Tucker.

6  
7 BRUCE A. BAIRD, Covington &  
8 Burling LLP, Washington, D.C.,  
9 for Gregory Bowes.

10  
11 ANDREW J. LEVANDER, Dechert LLP,  
12 New York, New York (Neil A.  
13 Steiner, on the brief), for  
14 Andres Piedrahita.

15  
16 ANDREW HAMMOND, White & Case LLP,  
17 New York, New York (Glenn M.  
18 Kurtz, on the brief), for Walter  
19 M. Noel, Jr.

20  
21 EDWARD M. SPIRO, Morvillo  
22 Abramowitz Grand Iason & Anello  
23 P.C., for David B. Horn and  
24 Robert A. Blum.

25  
26 SEAN F. O'SHEA, O'Shea Partners  
27 LLP, New York, New York, for  
28 Cornelis Boele.

29  
30 Appeal from a judgment of the United States District  
31 Court for the Southern District of New York (Marrero, J.).  
32

33 **UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED**  
34 **AND DECREED** that the judgment of the district court be  
35 **AFFIRMED.**

36  
37 Miguel Lomeli and Morning Mist Holdings Limited appeal  
38 from the judgment of the United States District Court for  
39 the Southern District of New York (Marrero, J.), approving a  
40 partial class action settlement. The underlying class

1 action (the "Anwar action") alleges that the defendants made  
2 material misstatements concerning their due diligence while  
3 investing with Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC.  
4 During the district court proceedings, the plaintiffs and  
5 the Fairfield Greenwich defendants settled on a basis that  
6 requires the plaintiffs to release any derivative claims on  
7 behalf of the Fairfield Greenwich funds. The appellants  
8 filed a derivative claim in New York state court on behalf  
9 of one of the funds, Fairfield Sentry Limited ("Sentry")  
10 (the "Morning Mist action"). That action was removed to the  
11 Southern District of New York and then remanded back to  
12 state court. Sentry is undergoing a liquidation proceeding  
13 in the British Virgin Islands, however, and the Morning Mist  
14 action therefore has been stayed by the Bankruptcy Court for  
15 the Southern district of New York. Additionally, Sentry has  
16 filed a direct action against the Fairfield Greenwich  
17 defendants, also in the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern  
18 District of New York. See Fairfield Sentry Ltd. V.  
19 Fairfield Greenwich Grp., Adv. Pro. No. 10-03800 (Bankr.  
20 S.D.N.Y. Oct. 27, 2011). The appellants object to the  
21 settlement insofar as it requires them to release their  
22 derivative claims, and cites deficiencies in the settlement

1 notice. They also appeal the district court's decision not  
2 to reconsider the approval in light of the Supreme Court's  
3 decision in Comcast Corp. v. Behrend, 133 S. Ct. 1426  
4 (2013). We assume the parties' familiarity with the  
5 underlying facts, the procedural history, and the issues  
6 presented for review.

7 We review the approval of a class action settlement for  
8 abuse of discretion. Charron v. Wiener, 731 F.3d 241, 247  
9 (2d Cir. 2013). "A district court abuses its discretion  
10 when its decision rests on an error of law or a clearly  
11 erroneous factual finding, or when its decision cannot be  
12 located within the range of permissible decisions." Id.  
13 "We review factual findings relating to the settlement for  
14 clear error and issues of law *de novo*." Id. A district  
15 court's denial of a motion for reconsideration is also  
16 reviewed for abuse of discretion. RJE Corp. v. Northville  
17 Indus. Corp., 329 F.3d 310, 316 (2d Cir. 2003).

18 1. Scope of the Release

19 "[I]n order to achieve a comprehensive settlement that  
20 would prevent relitigation of settled questions at the core  
21 of a class action, a court may permit the release of a claim  
22 . . . even though the claim was not presented and might not

1 have been presentable in the class action." TBK Partners,  
2 Ltd. v. Western Union Corp., 675 F.2d 456, 460 (2d Cir.  
3 1982). The "[p]laintiffs' authority to release claims is  
4 limited by the 'identical factual predicate' and 'adequacy  
5 of representation' doctrines." Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v.  
6 Visa U.S.A., Inc., 396 F.3d 96, 106 (2d Cir. 2005); see also  
7 TBK Partners, 675 F.2d at 460-62.

8 The claims in the Anwar action and the derivative  
9 claims in the Morning Mist action share a single factual  
10 predicate: the alleged misconduct of the Fairfield Greenwich  
11 defendants in failing to conduct adequate due diligence, and  
12 misrepresentations regarding their due diligence. The  
13 district court recognized this identity when it initially  
14 agreed to consolidate the two actions. See Anwar v.  
15 Fairfield Greenwich Grp., No. 1:09-cv-00118, (S.D.N.Y. June  
16 9, 2009, ECF No. 167). The appellants do not contest this  
17 identity.

18 "Adequate representation of a particular claim is  
19 established mainly by showing an alignment of interests  
20 between class members." Wal-Mart Stores, 396 F.3d at 106-  
21 07. Since the plaintiff class is composed of equity holders  
22 in the Fairfield Greenwich funds (including Sentry), every

1 member of the class has an interest in claims that may be  
2 made derivatively on behalf of the funds. Nor do the  
3 appellants claim that the release disproportionately affects  
4 them relative to other class members. Therefore, adequate  
5 representation exists to release derivative claims that may  
6 be pursued by the settling class.

7 We are unpersuaded that Sentry's absence from the class  
8 nullifies the settlement. The settlement only limits the  
9 settling class from bringing a derivative action, an action  
10 that belongs to the corporation. See Scalisi v. Fund Asset  
11 Mgmt., L.P., 380 F.3d 133, 138 (2d Cir. 2004). Nothing in  
12 the settlement limits the ability of Sentry to pursue an  
13 action for its benefit or the ability of class members who  
14 opt out to pursue derivative claims. Furthermore, the  
15 appellants' reliance on National Super Spuds, Inc. v. New  
16 York Mercantile Exchange is misplaced: in that case, the  
17 factual predicate and adequate representation tests were not  
18 satisfied. 660 F.2d 9, 18 n.7, 19 (2d Cir. 1981); see also  
19 Wal-Mart Stores, 396 F.3d at 110-11.

## 20 2. The Settlement Notice

21 A settlement notice must be reasonable. Fed. R. Civ.  
22 P. 23(e)(2). "There are no rigid rules to determine whether



1 a settlement notice to the class satisfies constitutional or  
2 Rule 23(e) requirements." Masters v. Wilhelmina Model  
3 Agency, Inc., 473 F.3d 423, 438 (2d Cir. 2007) (quoting Wal-  
4 Mart Stores, 396 F.3d at 114). "[T]he settlement notice  
5 must 'fairly apprise the prospective members of the class of  
6 the terms of the proposed settlement and of the options that  
7 are open to them in connection with the proceedings.'" Id.

8 This notice informed the class members that they would  
9 not be able to participate in any other proceeding against  
10 the Fairfield Greenwich defendants in any forum. The notice  
11 warned class members to seek counsel if they were involved  
12 in any litigation against the defendants, directed them to  
13 the stipulation, and explained how to opt out if they wanted  
14 to preserve their claims.

15 The settlement notice here did not specifically refer  
16 to the Morning Mist derivative action. While this Court  
17 encourages settlement notices to include "specific  
18 reference[s] to pending actions," we have never held this to  
19 be a requirement. Wal-Mart Stores, 396 F.3d at 116 n.22.  
20 The settlement notice was reasonable and could be  
21 "understood by the average class member." Id. at 114.

3. Reconsideration of the Settlement Approval

The appellants sought reconsideration of the district court's settlement approval in light of the Supreme Court's decision in Comcast Corp. v. Behrend, 133 S. Ct. 1426 (2013). We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying reconsideration for the reasons articulated in its decision and order. See Anwar v. Fairfield Greenwich Ltd., No. 1:09-cv-00118 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 4, 2013, ECF No. 1104).

For the foregoing reasons, and finding no merit in the appellants' other arguments, we hereby **AFFIRM** the judgment of the district court.

FOR THE COURT:  
CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, CLERK

  
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

A True Copy

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit

  
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe